

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/431,469	ARMISTEAD ET AL.	
	Examiner Marjorie A. Moran	Art Unit 1631	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Marjorie A. Moran. (3) Larry Coury.
 (2) Kristin Jocelyn. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10 October 2002.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 19.

Identification of prior art discussed: HENDRY.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The proposed amendment to claim 19 was discussed. The examiner stated that the proposed claim language appears to overcome rejections made under 35 USC 101 and 103, but cautioned that she would have to review any amendment for new matter, enablement and would have to perform a search of the prior art. Language to further clarify the claims was also discussed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Note: proposed amendment attached.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/431,469	ARMISTEAD ET AL.
	Examiner Marjorie A. Moran	Art Unit 1631

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Marjorie A. Moran. (3) _____.

(2) Kristin Jocelyn. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 November 2002.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 19-30.

Identification of prior art discussed: HENDRY.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner informed Ms. Jocelyn that upon further review, claims 25-30 were not allowable. As the crystal coordinates recited in the method are nonfunctional descriptive material, the method steps are obvious over prior art teaching an in silico determination of binding and synthesis and in vitro testing of a compound identified in the in silico method. The examiner stated that she would withdraw finality of the office action and issue a new, nonfinal office action. The examine also stated that all the claims appeared to be statutory, and that she would specifically state reasons for this in the next office action. The examiner apologized for the inconvenience to applicant due to the change in how the claims are interpreted.